

**REMARKS**

This responds to the office action mailed May 26, 2005.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 19 as obvious under 35 USC 103(a) in light of Lokey (US Patent 3,785,230) combined with Becht (US Patent 5,094,000) or Nymann (US Patent 4,029,159). The Examiner says the claims are obvious because Lokey shows detection and reaction systems and Becht and Nymann show stopping a woodworking tool during coast down. This rejection is traversed because no reference teaches or suggests imparting an electric signal to the working portion and monitoring that signal during a defined period of time after the motor has been turned off. Additionally, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references. Nevertheless, applicant has amended claims 17 and 19 to more particularly point out the coverage currently sought.

Claim 17 now specifies that "the detection system and reaction system are configured to function when the motor is moving the working portion and for a defined period of time after the motor has been turned off, and where the reaction system is configured not to cause the predetermined action to take place after the defined period of time has past until the motor starts moving the working portion." Lokey does not teach or suggest monitoring a signal after the motor is turned off, nor does Becht or Nymann. Moreover, no reference teaches or suggests any period of time during which a reaction system is active but after which the reaction system is not active until the motor starts moving the working portion. Accordingly, claim 17 as amended is not obvious because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all the limitations of that claim. MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations must be taught or suggested).

Page 8 - THIRD AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 09/929,234

Claim 19 now specifies that "the control system is adapted to trigger the reaction system if the dangerous condition is detected when the motor is spinning the cutting tool or during coast-down of the cutting tool after the motor is turned off and to deactivate the reaction system after coast-down." None of the cited references disclose or suggest this limitation. Therefore, claim 19 as amended is not obvious because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all the limitations of that claim. MPEP 2143.03.

**Allowed Subject Matter**

The Examiner indicated that claims 1, 8-11 and 16 are allowable.

**Withdrawn Claims**


Applicant requests that withdrawn claims 2-7 and 12-15 be reinstated because they depend from allowed claims.

**New Claims**

Applicant is adding new claims 21 and 22 that depend from claim 19.

Respectfully submitted,

SD3, LLC



David Fanning, Esq.

Registration No. 33,233

Customer No. 27630

22409 S.W. Newland Road


Wilsonville, Oregon 97070

Telephone: (503) 638-6201

Facsimile: (503) 638-8601

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE**

I hereby certify that this correspondence and its accompanying attachment are being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Attention: Examiner Boyer D. Ashley, Group Art Unit 3724, to facsimile number: (571) 273-8300 on August 17, 2005.

  
David Fanning

Page 9 - THIRD AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 09/929,234